#### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended to present the claims in better form for allowance and for possible consideration on appeal. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the proposed amendments. Claims 11-18 have been cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-10 are now are presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Olarig et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,167,476 ("Olarig").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and maintains the argument that Olarig does not disclose or reasonably suggest receiving AGP transaction requests at a first bus interface from a core logic device as recited by claim 1. In other words, Olarig's AGP device serving as a master device and "[w]hen the master has completed transferring all the requests it has, the AGP to AGP bridge will process the write commands. The master will need to get write data into the AGP to AGP bridge so that, when the core logic requests the data, the master will have the data available" (col. 15, lines 11-21) is not the same as "receiving accelerated AGP transaction requests at a first bus interface from the core logic device, and transmitting the AGP transaction requests to the core logic device" as recited by claim 1 (emphasis provided)

Furthermore, although Olarig discloses having a "target and arbiter 248" in figure

Docket No: 42390P6727C2 Application No.: 10/785,281 4A (fig. 4A, col. 11, line 3), it does not disclose or reasonably suggest "<u>arbitrating access</u> to the first bus interface <u>using a request arbiter</u> coupled to the second bus interface" as recited by claim 1 (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 5 and 8 contain limitations similar to those claim 1. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 8

and their dependent claims.

### Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Docket No: 42390P6727C2 Application No.: 10/785,281

# Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

## Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

## **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 25, 2005

Aslam A. Jaffery

Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, California 90025-1030 (303) 740-1980

Docket No: 42390P6727C2 Application No.: 10/785,281